

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
<b>A. GENERAL COMPARISON</b>								
A.1. Population of Municipality	651,154 (2000) 81 square miles 8,058 people per square mile	559,034 (2005) 48 square miles 12,165 people per square mile	2,896,016 227.1 square miles 12,516 people per square mile	316,718 (2005) 56 square miles 6,019 people per square mile	550,521 (2005) 61 square miles 9,316 people per square mile	356,321 134.4 sq miles 2,651 people per sq mile	776,733 46.7 square miles 15,870 people per square mile 149,500 buildings (primary structures)	Baltimore’s estimated population in 2005 was just over 600,000. Three case study cities are very close to that size, with two slightly smaller (300,000s) and one that is significantly larger, but provides interesting comparisons.
A.2. Prominent waterway or body of water?	Baltimore Inner Harbor	Boston Harbor and Atlantic Ocean	Lake Michigan, Chicago River	3 rivers: Allegheny, Monongahela, Ohio	Potomac River	Small lakes	San Francisco Bay and Pacific Ocean	-
A.3. Basis of the preservation ordinance (State/local?)	Maryland State Code Article 66B for Zoning powers Planning powers derived from Baltimore City charter	State enabling legislation (Chapter 772 of the Acts of I of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts)	IL Constitution (Article VII, Section 6) Purpose includes reducing urban blight, encouraging orderly and efficient development, and survey Chicago	Local (city)	DC Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act of 1978 (D.C. Law 2-144).	NC state enabling legislation (General Statutes 160A-400.1-400.14). State enabling legislation places historic districts within purview of planning.	California Government Code (Sections 65850 and 37361) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Mirror of NEPA) Discretionary permits on any designated or eligible properties. Acts as SHPO for this review. Religious institutions cannot be designated without owner consent.	Most cities rely on state enabling legislation. California has a state wide program, a mirror of NEPA, that provides an extra layer of protection for historic resources for all undertakings, whether public or private.
A.4. Official name of CLG and Commission	Commission for Historical and Architectural Preservation	Boston Landmarks Commission (BLC) BLC functions in conjunction with local Historic District Commissions.	Chicago Landmarks Commission	Historic Review Commission of Pittsburgh	Historic Preservation Review Board Staff is known as the Historic Preservation Office	City of Raleigh/Raleigh Historic Districts Commission	City and County of San Francisco (Landmark Preservation Advisory Board advisory agency) Planning Commission has delegated decisions to Board	-
A.5. Home department within local government (Planning, Environment, etc.)	Planning Department	Environment Department “The City's Environment Department aims to protect our built and natural environments...	Planning and Development	City Planning	Office of Planning	City Planning	Planning Department	All preservation offices, with exception of Boston, are located in the planning departments. All interviewees stated that they thought this was the most appropriate location.

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
		The Environment Department protects Boston's wealth of historic sites, buildings, landscapes, and waterways through protective designation and review.”						This appears to be the most appropriate and effective location for CHAP offices in the Baltimore City government.
A.6. Number of Historic Districts	30 local Historic Districts	8 locally designated districts, with own local commissions, guidelines for design review, deadlines, and meeting dates  Over 40 NR districts	45 local Landmark Districts Roughly 6,500 properties total	12 local Historic Districts	Over 30 (listed in DC Inventory of Historic Sites)  Historic districts are not protected until they are nominated to the National Register	Historic Overlay Districts (5 local)	Districts (11 local)	Chicago, like Baltimore, has a high level of local historic districts which they are responsible for regulating; however, Chicago is also a much larger City (land and population). Comparable sized cities tend to have far fewer local historic districts. Exception is Washington DC – all of their local districts are also listed in the National Register.
A.7. Number of individual landmarks	125 Landmarks	80  Over 10,000 buildings listed in NR	238 Landmarks Roughly 6,500 properties total	75 Landmarks	Over 500 Landmarks (listed in DC Inventory of Historic Sites)	130 Landmarks	253 Landmarks	Number of Landmarks varies considerably by city.
A.8. Other resources reviewed by Commission (landscape/parks, archeology, conservation districts, city properties, monuments, interiors)?	NR nominations City owned properties City-owned monuments	Landmarks include parks (significant number of parks and open space), public interiors One archeological site Conservation districts are local historic district with local, not regional, significance. Landmarks and landmark districts must have regional or national significance	NR nominations Assist with Sec. 106 review for certain city agencies Floor area bonuses for downtown development program (“Adopt-a-landmark”) Designated interiors	Sites and objects.	Function as the SHPO for DC so review everything: -designated landscapes -city properties (designated) -archeology -easements/covenants -National Register -Section 106 consultation -federal properties -public spaces	Designated interior features (Raleigh received authority in 1993.) Complimentary review for projects adjacent to historic overlay districts Subdivisions reviewed if they are in local historic overlay districts No National Register reviews or control by commission	Landmark defined as structure, landscape feature, site or area. Parks and Recreation handles new design. Districts drawn around parks to specifically exclude them. Structures of merit: structures that are not officially designated as landmarks and are not situated in designated historic districts. Not protected within planning	Types of resources reviewed varies. Baltimore’s review of NR nominations and city owned properties is fairly typical.

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
					-interiors		code. Rated buildings in conservation districts- Downtown conservation district (6) Alterations handled at staff level. Interiors of publicly owned properties. Recently amended to include interiors of privately owned landmarks that are in area generally open to the public (theaters). CEQA and Section 106 review for federally funded projects within city	
A.9. Year of Commission establishment	1964	1975.	1968.	1979.	1978	1961.	1967.	-
B. PROCESS AND PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF HISTORIC RESOURCES								
General Topics								
B.1. What is the legislative codification process for designating a landmark or district (ordinance, etc.)?	Ordinance	Ordinance	Ordinance	City preservation ordinance.	Ordinance	Ordinance Ordinance for Landmarks contains: (1) Description of property, (2) Owner of the property . (3) Description of elements integral to significance. (4) Describe the nature of the commission's jurisdiction over the interior, if any (5) Require that the waiting period set forth in the general statutes be observed prior to its demolition. (6) Sign or plaque	Ordinance Ordinance for designation may reference report, include descriptions, and guidelines, explains relationship to Planning Code.	-

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
						<p>indicating that the property has been so designated.</p> <p>(7) Grantor/grantee index</p> <p>Landmarks are established by ordinance.</p> <p>Historic Districts are listed in zoning ordinance (overlay district that controls exterior features).</p>		
B.2. What comes first – zoning approvals or historic district approvals?	Zoning approvals must be applied for first.	<p>Applicants are required to get zoning approval for regulatory relief prior to coming before Historic District Commissions for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)</p> <p>COA required before a building permit.</p>	Unknown	Unknown	Zoning approval is required first.	Historic district is considered an overlay within the existing zoning code.	Unknown	In cities where a response was received, zoning approvals were required prior to applications being heard by the Historic Commissions.
B.3. Proactive or reactive survey and documentation for listing of historic resources?	Proactive (inclusion of preservation issues within neighborhood master plans) and reactive.	Proactive.	<p>Both.</p> <p>1995 historic resource survey ranked all architecturally significant buildings based on age, integrity, and significance. Red were most significant, orange had local significance, green and yellow shades lacked integrity, blue was for properties built after 1940.</p> <p>Public form on website for landmark suggestions from community</p>	Reactive. HRC does not perform survey.	Both. Staff does some proactive surveying or oversees consultant survey teams. Some reactive, initiated by community members.	Proactive.	Proactive. Reconnaissance and Intensive surveys ongoing. Mid 1980s architectural survey of all downtown buildings. Buildings rated as Significant Category I, Significant Category II, Contributory, Contributory Category III, Contributory Category IV, Category V Unrated buildings	<p>With exception of Pittsburgh, all cities do some level of proactive surveying and documentation. In many cases this leads to additional justification for landmark designation or interim protection.</p> <p>Due to CHAP’s location within the Planning Department, it would seem reasonable that the departments could work together in undertaking planning studies that would also assist in surveying and getting a better handle on the resources that remain in</p>

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
								the City that are currently unprotected. More proactive surveying and designation should be encouraged.
B.4. Are significant landscapes or natural landmarks designated?	Yes	Landscapes are designated. Boston has template for landscape guidelines. Natural land conservation not designated	Yes and No. Natural landmarks are not designated. City does designate man-made landscapes (one, also a NHL). Generally do not designate landscapes because landscape changes do not require permits, making it hard to regulate change. Landscape review would require control that is above current ordinance.	Yes. They designate historic buildings/structures, districts, sites, and objects.	Yes. Listings nominated for the DC Inventory of Historic Sites may include buildings, interiors, structures, monuments, works of art, areas, places, sites, neighborhoods, networks, and cultural landscapes. Example: L’Enfant Plan of city streets is on NR. Estates, terraced lawns, and gardens are also listed.	Yes. Tree landmarks program has died.	Yes. Golden Gate park has designated landscape plaza.	Most cities have some level of designation of natural features and/or landscapes.  DCs potentials for these listings is perhaps the greatest, and is most explicitly spelled out within their ordinance.  Boston has developed landscape guideline template for designated landscapes.  Other cities, like Pittsburgh. Have very broad language – “sites and objects” which presumably natural landmarks and landscape features could fall into. With exception of Boston and DC, actually listings on all cities are limited.
B.5. Are interiors designated? If yes, what criteria and process is followed?	No	Yes. They have been. There are currently approximately 20 interior Landmark designations in the City.  However, the Ordinance states “no designation of the interior portion of any improvement shall be	Yes. Criteria same as designation in general. Interior designated along with exterior. For landmark designation, they will look for significant interiors. Significant historical and architectural features, which may include all exterior elevations, rooflines,	No. HRC jurisdiction only includes what can be seen from public right-of-way; interiors, property use, and building parts not visible from street are not covered.	Yes. 12-15 local and national interior designations, including apt. bldg. lobbies and bank lobbies.  HPO reviews applications for interior work to ensure it does not impact exterior.	Yes. Public interiors may be designated. Private interiors may also be designated, which is binding for future owners. Currently only one public interior designated.	Yes. Interiors of publicly owned properties. Recently amended to include interiors of privately owned landmarks that are in area generally open to the public (theaters).	With exception of Pittsburgh, all comparison cities can designate interiors.  Specifics vary by city but almost all use their power to designate interiors on a limited basis to accommodate only significant, public interiors.



# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
		<p>made unless notice pursuant to this section and the designation specifically indicates that said interior shall be designated”.</p> <p>Interiors may be designated in Historic Beacon Hill District and back Bay Residential District, per the ordinance.</p>	<p>and interiors, included as part of landmark designation ordinance. Standards are high. Interior must be generally open to the public (lobby, auditorium) and needs to be very special. Must meet high bar.</p> <p>For districts, ordinance includes designation of parts of buildings seen from public right of way, does not include alleyways. Don’t include interiors within district nominations.</p>		<p>HPRB is reluctant to designate interiors because they do not have the capability to inspect.</p> <p>Designation would undergo same process as designating a landmark building.</p>			<p>Cities recognize it is difficult to monitor/inspect interiors.</p> <p>Baltimore should consider the benefits to designating significant public interiors (note: some of which have already been lost in recent years)</p>
<b>Establishment of Historic Districts</b>								
<p>B.6. Criteria followed for designation of an historic district (i.e.: National Register standards, other?)</p>	<p>Based on National Register Criteria with additional criteria for historic districts:</p> <p>Dates from a period of significance to the City</p> <p>Associated with an outstanding historical person</p> <p>Site of an historic event with an impact on Baltimore</p> <p>Significant example from its architectural period</p> <p>Notable work of a master designer / architect / builder</p> <p>Exemplifies importance related to heritage of the City</p> <p>Has or is expected to yield archeological information</p>	<p>National Register Criteria</p>	<p>Seven criteria (unique to Chicago but share some similarities with NR), which includes “Distinctive Theme as a District” and “Unique Visual Feature.”</p> <p>Districts must meet at least two of these criteria. Must also meet integrity criterion.</p> <p>Districts have contributing and auxiliary structures.</p>	<p>Must meet at least 1 of 10 HRC Criteria and retain integrity of location, design, materials and workmanship. Criteria for any designation type are the same.</p>	<p>Based on National Register Criteria for Designation, with some expansions (total of six criteria) to include natural forms and landscapes. They have been personalized specifically for Washington DC.</p>	<p>State statute to model National Register Criteria, but are not the same</p> <p>Within districts, contributing and accessory structures.</p>	<p>National Register Criteria by rules and procedures of Landmark Board</p> <p>Properties listed as contributory, contributory altered, or noncontributory</p>	<p>All criteria for designation of an historic district are, or are heavily based on, National Register Criteria.</p> <p>This appears to be the widely accepted national standard/basis.</p>

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE "GUIDELINES" PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
B.7. Are there different levels of historic district designation for historic districts?	No	<p>Landmark District: An area containing physical features or improvements which are of significance to the city and the Commonwealth, the New England region or the nation and cause such an area to constitute a distinctive section of the City.</p> <p>Architectural Conservation District: Similar to a Landmark District but with a lower threshold of significance.</p> <p>Protective Area: An area which is contiguous to and is an essential part of the physical environment of a Landmark, Landmark District, or Architectural Conservation District. Maximum boundary, 1200 feet.</p>	No.	No.	No.	<p>Historic Overlay Districts.</p> <p>Neighborhood Conservation Districts are reviewed by other planning staff, each has own neighborhood plan and there is no design or demolition review.</p>	No.	<p>Boston and Raleigh are the only two cities with multiple levels of district designation and Raleigh is a unique example in that their districts are based on zoning.</p> <p>Boston's three tiered system allows for different levels of control and review, recognizing that is necessary for different districts based on their condition, character, etc.</p> <p>Given the condition and integrity of some of Baltimore's local historic districts, the potential for a secondary level of review requirements (possibly conservation districts) should be considered.</p>
B.8. Procedure followed for designating a historic district	<p>Designation requested by community members</p> <p>Obtain signatures of majority of property owners</p> <p>Present application to CHAP</p> <p>CHAP considers against Standards for Designation</p> <p>CHAP approval forwarded to Planning Commission</p>	<p>See B.13.</p> <p>However, for district designations, the Mayor appoints a Study Committee to prepare the Study Report. The committee will include 5 Landmarks Commissioners and 6 persons with a demonstrated interest in the district. The</p>	See B.13	<p>Upon nomination, HRC notifies owners via letter of receipt of nomination and all pertinent subsequent hearings/decisions.</p> <p>Public info meeting on meaning of designation held by HRC for district-level nominations within 6 months <b>prior</b> to nomination. HRC makes prelim</p>	<p>Apply for designation. Within 10 days of receipt, HPO reviews for completeness.</p> <p>Thereafter, a landmark is protected by law until a final decision is made. Districts are not protected until nominated to NR.</p> <p>HPRB schedules a public hearing, giving 30 days advance notice.</p>	Treated in same manner as any request for change in city zoning ordinance	See B.13	<p>Chicago's procedures may be most applicable to Baltimore.</p> <p>Chicago has a similar city structure where city council and mayor can delay designation. The designation process may be a good model to study for applicability to Baltimore. It is labor intensive for the</p>

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
	<p>Planning Commission approval written into Ordinance</p> <p>Review by Urban Affairs Committee at public hearing</p> <p>Presentation to City Council</p> <p>Approved Ordinance signed by Mayor and CC President</p> <p><b>Pilot Process:</b></p> <p>Boundaries defined based on “Standards for Designation”</p> <p>Community Association makes formal request to CHAP</p> <p>Staff mails letters to all property owners</p> <p>Staff holds public meetings, as desired</p> <p>Staff reviews results of mailing and presents to Commission</p> <p>Commission makes determination about application</p> <p>Application presented at public hearing</p> <p>Then follows same public review procedure as existing process</p>	<p>report is forwarded to Boston Redevelopment Authority and MA Hist. Comm. Before public hearing.</p> <p>Once a district is officially designated, the Mayor appoints a commission to administer design review.</p>		<p>determination on whether meets criteria within 45 days. HRC protection of property begins 2 business days after mailing of notification of receipt of nomination and may continue up to 8 months. At least 1 public hearing on appropriateness of designation. HRC Staff prepares report on nominated resource and recommendation on whether it meets criteria for designation. HRC discusses in regular public meeting and makes recommendation to City Council within 5 months of nomination. City Planning Commission also makes recommendation to City Council concurrently with HRC. City Council holds public hearing and makes decision within 3 months of recommendation submittal. Total process is up to 8 months.</p>	<p>HPO staff prepares written recommendation prior to public hearing.</p> <p>At public hearing makes a decision whether to list on DC Inventory of Historic Sites.</p> <p>If HPRB recommends nomination to NR, HPO staff prepares nomination</p>			<p>Commission staff. However, it does due diligence in educating, notifying, and engaging the public prior to officially sending designation to city council. There are also clear limits on delays to reviewing designations. The Commission gets to state the boundaries of the resource rather than politics. This is balanced by city council power to reject the designation and refuse to look at any designation for the same district or landmark unless substantially new information is presented.</p> <p>Pittsburgh’s procedure also appears to be fairly standard, though there is not as much weight given to public involvement as there is in Chicago. However, this was not discussed with a staff member so there may be inside information that was not immediately apparent in our on-line reviews.</p> <p>Baltimore’s pilot process also places a heavy burden on CHAP staff. Additional staff member is warranted who can focus on this type of outreach effort with the community, if the pilot process is formally adopted.</p>



# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
B.9. Documentation required for the district (list of contributing/non contributing resources, period of significance statements, historical characteristics, planning issues, boundary justifications, other)	Prepared by CHAP staff	The BLC is responsible for the development of a Study report, which must include: -economic status, -boundaries, -description, -significance, -character, and -considerations of related master plans, etc.	Narrative report: -brief property history, -state how it meets criteria, -significant features	Similar to NRHP. Historical and current name; location map and list of addresses; classification; nominator info; physical description, addressing style, materials, construction method, setting, changes over time, street pattern, density; type of bldgs., topography and development patterns; narrative history of resource or district addressing history of area; significance statement; documentation of notification/consent of property owners; numbered photographs with subject captions;  \$50 fee for nomination of structure or object; \$100 fee for nomination of district or site.	Research and documentation to complete application form includes., physical description, statement of significance, narrative statement of history, photographs, map, and bibliography.  For minor projects presentations require photographs, architectural plans, detailed specifications.  For major projects, presentations should include rendered plans, photographic slides, architectural model or perspectives, materials samples, models of replacement windows.  Response to how project preserves the property and how is it compatible.  Application fee required and can range from \$250-\$1000 depending on size of district	Designation report with state statute requirements (investigation and report describing significance and boundaries, map for rezoning)	Research and creation of designation report for each property within district, includes date of construction, the architect or builder, style, design features, historic and physical contexts and an integrity assessment, also letter of authorization from owners, photos and Sanborn maps.	Baltimore and Boston are the only cities that put the burden of documentation on the staff and not the applicant.  The burden for developing and preparing the supporting materials should be on the applicant, with staff given discretionary role in preparing nominations. For consistency, Baltimore will need to prepare a nomination form.
<b>Establishment of Individual Landmarks</b>								
B.10. Criteria used for designation of an individual landmark (i.e.: National Register standards, other?)	National Register	See B.6.	Seven criteria (unique to Chicago but share some similarities with NR), which includes “Distinctive Theme as a District” and “Unique Visual Feature.” Landmarks must meet	See B.6.	Criteria modeled after National Register Criteria with some embellishment to include natural forms and to personalize for Washington DC	State statute to model National Register Criteria, but are not the same	National Register Criteria by rules and procedures of Landmark Board	All criteria based on and modeled after National Register Criteria.  This is a suitable for developing criteria for Baltimore. Additions could be made to accommodate

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
			at least two of these criteria. Must also meet integrity criterion.					circumstances special to Baltimore.
B.11. Are there age requirements for designation?	No	No. Informal 25 year age requirement.	No.	No.	Stated that “sufficient time must have passed to permit professional evaluation of the landmark or historic district”	No.	No. Designation of properties less than 50 years old are suggested to be informally presented to Landmarks Board first.	No cities have specific age requirements for designation.
B.12. Are there issues with designating buildings of living architects?	Nothing formal, though the issue has come up recently.	No. It has not been an issue.	Nothing in ordinance, but probably would not do it.	None stated. Not confirmed with City staff.	No.	No.	No.	No city has specifically addressed this topic in the preservation ordinance. Only Chicago identified that they would not likely allow for the designation of a building of a living architect.
B.13. Procedure followed for designating a landmark	CHAP staff, property owner, or public may nominate a landmark. CHAP staff prepare recommendation. Public hearing is held by Commission. Owner of record is notified by certified mail and regular mail, at least 10 days prior to hearing. Landmark hearing is also posted on website and interested parties are also notified. If approved, CHAP forwards nomination to the Planning Commission. If approved, the request for designation is written into and ordinance and introduced into City Council. The Ordinance is referred to the Urban	Within 30 days of nomination a preliminary hearing is scheduled to determine whether petition warrants further study. If accepted, site is considered a “pending designation”. If not accepted, a notice is sent to property owner and other parties within 30 days. Commission prepares a study that includes significance, condition, boundaries, and recommends standards and criteria for review. Public hearing is held within 60 days. If Commission approves, designation includes design guidelines to be used by Commission in reviewing future	Landmark and District designation handled in almost the same process: First, property owners of record are mailed via certified mail a summary of preliminary findings report, information on becoming a landmark or district. For landmark, will propose designation of entire legal parcel. For district, Commission defines boundaries of resource. For district, there are often many return mailings for incorrect addresses. Then the Commission resends initial information packet to the tax payers of record on property as second layer of public notification. Takes three months for this preliminary mailing. Then planning and development report developed regarding relationship to	See B.8.  Three Key Step Process: 1. Nomination 2. Protection—nominated properties put under HRC jurisdiction and prelim. determination given within 45 days of nomination 3. Public hearing on appropriateness of designation.	Same as B.8.	Commission creates report and internal review Recommendation to full commission Recommendation to City Council City Council sends out to State and other review bodies City Council holds joint public hearing with Commission for listening Matter referred to Commission Returns to Council with final recommendation	Planning staff review preliminary designation report. Advisory Board has 60 days to comment, includes public hearing. Planning Commission holds public hearing held at Landmarks Board for ordinance. Property owner(s) notified by mail and advertisement in newspaper. If approved, designation as ordinance reviewed by City Attorney and returned to Landmarks Board. Note: designation of structures of merit do not require approval by Board of Supervisors.	Baltimore City procedure for designation of Local Landmarks is appropriate and generally consistent with other cities.

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
	<p>Affairs Committee. The area is posted according to the City's zoning regulations, and a public hearing is held. The Urban Affairs Committee reports to the City Council as to whether or not it recommends the designation of the Landmark.</p> <p>If the report is favorable, the 3<sup>rd</sup> reader of the Ordinance occurs the following weeks. The Ordinance is subsequently signed by the President of the City Council and the Mayor.</p>	<p>changes.</p> <p>Designation then presented to the Mayor for approval.</p> <p>Mayor transmits approval to City Council, which has up to 30 days to overturn.</p> <p>After, designation is deemed official and is filed with deeds, the clerk, building commissioner, and Public Impr. Comm.</p>	<p>Comprehensive Plan and effect on surrounding neighborhood. Currently, designations are made within the planning department, so preservation and planning goals often already in harmony. This allows department to state that it fits into larger planning goals. Planning has 60 days (landmark) or 90 days (district) to create preliminary planning report.</p> <p>Then Commission finds out public opinion on designation during period of consent. Consent period is 45 days. Owner consent not required, except in case of actively used religious buildings.</p> <p>Property owners and tax payers are sent “request for consent” form using the addresses from the preliminary mailing.</p> <p>Property owner must respond within 45 days (possible 120 day extension) or designation goes to public hearing, which is posted on site and in neighborhood.</p> <p>Individual landmark designation may be delayed 120 days by property owner. For district, all aldermen of area within districts must agree to delay designation.</p> <p>There may not be a public hearing for landmark; there is only a hearing if the property owner dissents.</p> <p>With a district, there is always at least one public</p>					

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE "GUIDELINES" PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
			<p>hearing for interested parties (property owners, property owners within 500 feet, any individual, organization, or entity whose enjoyment of resource would be affected).</p> <p>This is long process, but shows that Commission has done due diligence in front of City Council. Often results in property owners viewing Commission in more favorable light.</p> <p>Since there are many political possibilities for not approving district, Commission does a lot of homework before proposing designations to City Council.</p>					
<p>B.14. Documentation required for the landmark (list of contributing/non contributing resources for site, period of significance statements, historical characteristics, planning issues, boundary justifications, other)</p>	Prepared by CHAP staff	Same as B.9.	Same as B.9.	Same as B.9.	<p>Same as B.9.</p> <p>Application fee required. \$100 for up to five buildings and \$200 for one of more than five buildings.</p>	<p>Name of property (both common and historic names)</p> <p>Name and address of the current property owner.</p> <p>Location, including the street address and County tax map and parcel numbers or the parcel identification number.</p> <p>Date of construction and of any later alterations, if any.</p> <p>Assessment of significance</p> <p>Description of area of site or structure, including outbuildings, etc.</p> <p>Historical discussion/context</p> <p>B&amp;W photos (all facades, details, siting)</p>	<p>Research and creation of designation report for each property includes date of construction, the architect or builder, style, design features, historic and physical contexts and an integrity assessment, also letter of authorization from owners, photos and Sanborn maps..</p>	<p>Baltimore and Boston are the only cities that place the burden of documentation on the staff and not the applicant.</p> <p>The burden for developing and preparing the supporting materials should be on the applicant, with staff given discretionary role in preparing nominations. For consistency, Baltimore will need to prepare a nomination form.</p>

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
						Site map		
<b>Designation application, notification, support, and time limits</b>								
B.15. Sample designation form (NR form, etc.)	None	No. All designation forms are done internally. Sometimes use consultants, but always under direction of staff. Found that this is most consistent approach.	No.	Unknown	Unknown.	Nothing formal. Cover sheet form for a landmark (basic statistical information, sort of a front end NR form, and then says attach information on significance and integrity such as info. in B14)	Template provided (not NR form) State of CA form.	Baltimore should develop nomination form that is consistent with NR and MD forms.
B.16. Means by which property owners learn that their property is designated (deed, letter, tax bill). Notification for purchaser of historic property.	Mailed a letter regarding public hearings.  No official notification for purchasers of properties that are in a district or designated as a landmark.  Some individual districts do identify in property deed.	Mailed a letter prior to public hearing.	Notified by first class mail (six different opportunities for notification during process).  Recorder of deeds notes all landmark/district properties. Not all early landmarks are recorded.	Letters sent if nominated.	Property owners in a proposed district are notified of the proposal prior to the scheduled public hearing.  Neighborhood public forums to discuss the effect of the proposed designation are also required.	Tax maps Landmark: Letter sent to property owner. Grantee/Grantor index can be identified through title search.  Historic Districts: every property area for rezoning gets letter when under consideration, also anyone within 100 feet. Owners get notification when property is rezoned. No notification for purchaser of historic property.	Mailing to property owners during hearings and at time of designation.  Designation is recorded on deeds	In all instances, property owners are first officially notified through a letter form the City informing them that their property is designated. First letters typically occur at time of nomination with letters also mailed once officially designated.  Public district information available for buyers on deeds (Chicago, San Francisco) and zoning maps (Raleigh).  Baltimore needs consistent notification for buyers.
B.17. Who may nominate (anyone, Commissioners only, ten citizens)	District: Commissioners may propose or a majority of property owners within district  Landmark: Commissioners may propose	The mayor, 10 registered Boston voters, or any Commission member may make a nomination.	Anyone can suggest designation. Commission makes the official recommendation and notifies property owner and aldermen.	Mayor, Commissioners, staff, or any resident or property owner (at least 1 year city residency) in city of Pittsburgh may nominate structures, sites, objects, or districts; community organizations may nominate districts.	-Property owner -Historic Preservation Review Board -a government agency -Advisory Neighborhood Commission -or an organization with by-laws that have the purpose of promoting historic preservation	Landmarks nominated by owner, citizen, or Commission. Historic Overlay Districts nominated by Commission or others. Owner consent not needed for nomination. Owner signature taken off application.	Designation initiated by Board of Supervisors, city government commissions (including Planning), or property owners. Non-owners must work through these agencies.	The list of who may nominate varies. In all cases, the Historic Commission is in a position to make a nomination.
B.18. How do you	Existing process:	First, Mayor appoints 5 member study	“If 51 percent of the owners of the property	Nomination for district requires petition of	Not specifically stated	Neighborhood forum held by Commission to	District designation by property owners must	In Pittsburgh, only 25% of district residents must



# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
determine support for a nominated district?	<p>Through petition which includes signatures of majority of property owners within area to be designated.</p> <p>Pilot process: Through positive feedback and support from a majority of the property owners who respond to the community mailing.</p>	<p>committee, including significant support from community.</p> <p>Want to see considerable public support.</p> <p>Mailing sent out for study committee meeting.</p> <p>Study committee meets openly. Prior to petition.</p> <p>Petition, then study report published for 60 days for review.</p> <p>Then hold public hearing for designation.</p> <p>2/3 majority of Commission sends to Mayor.</p> <p>Does not require % of property owners. But district designation will require a lot of community input.</p>	<p>in a district responding to the request for consent file written objections to designation, a recommendation of landmark designation of that district must be approved by the affirmative vote of six members of the Commission.”</p>	<p>support signed by 25% of owners of record within boundaries of proposed district. Nominators of landmarks must demonstrate good-faith effort to notify owners of their interest in designation and present evidence of communication attempts.</p>	<p>in Ordinance.</p> <p>Lots of discussion of this issue right now – has become a significant issue. HPRB wants to see that substantial efforts were made to reach out to all aspects of the neighborhood.</p> <p>Staff asks all applicants to bring notebook documenting all outreach efforts made / publicity / meetings.</p> <p>Various ways of handling opposition – revise boundaries, postpone until things settle down.</p>	<p>understand feeling in community. Letters, brochures, and education for neighborhood.</p> <p>Neighborhood Associations have asked for designation.</p> <p>Petitions</p> <p>None of this is officially required. Property owner consent is not required.</p>	<p>include signatures of at least 66 and 2/3 percent of the property owners. District designation can be initiated by Commission, etc.</p> <p>Owners of at least 20% of properties to be designated can appeal designation.</p>	<p>support a nomination, while San Francisco requires 66 2/3%. 51% required in Chicago.</p> <p>Washington and Raleigh have more informal requirements, with no specific number or percentage of residents required to support a nomination.</p> <p>This is a big issue in DC and applicants are being asked to show a substantial amount of outreach to property owners and opposition to nominations has resulted in postponements and revised boundaries.</p> <p>Baltimore remains in middle ground by requiring a majority of property owners in support. Full implementation of pilot process would require only majority support from respondents.</p>
B.19. Next step beyond Commission approval (Planning Commission, City Council, Mayor?)	<p>CHAP recommends to Planning Commission.</p> <p>Upon approval request is written into ordinance and forwarded to City Council Urban Affairs Committee.</p> <p>If approved Ordinance signed by Council President and Mayor.</p>	<p>Commission makes recommendation to Mayor who makes recommendation to City Council.</p>	<p>Commission makes recommendation to City Council within 30 days of first public hearing, if required.</p> <p>Commission makes recommendation to Council within 30 days of public hearing, if required.</p> <p>Referred to City Council subcommittee,</p>	<p>HRC makes recommendation on designation to City Council, as does City Planning Commission (on same deadline as HRC). Final vote made by City Council.</p>	<p>HPRB makes recommendation to Mayor’s Agent.</p> <p>Final determination rests with the Mayor’s Agent.</p>	<p>Landmark goes to city Council</p> <p>Districts go to Planning Commission and then City Council.</p>	<p>Then to Land Use Committee of Board of Supervisors for third public hearing.</p> <p>Then to full Board of Supervisors for fourth public hearing and vote.</p> <p>Finally it is sent to the Mayor for signature.</p>	-

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
			which reviews designation at a public hearing. Typically done within 30 days, but can delay review for 365 days. Take vote and recommend to full City Council. City Council makes final vote. Then goes to Mayor for signature who has veto power, though this never done for designation. If voted down, landmark/district cannot be re-designated unless there is substantial new information.					
B.20. Time limits within which other parties must approve or reject nomination after Commission approval.	No time limits identified in current ordinance.	Mayor has 15 days to disapprove of Commissions recommendation.  City Council has 30 days to overturn the Mayor’s approval.	City Council has 365 days to decide on proposed designation. If there is no action, designation is automatically approved.	Unknown.	Staff has 60 days after filing to mail notice. Staff has 90 days after filing to schedule a hearing.	No.	Amended ordinance has time limit Planning Commission review has 90 days from referral from Board. Failure to act is a de facto approval. No time limits for Board of Supervisors.	With exception of Raleigh, all cities have time limits.  Time limits would help to expedite a sometimes slow process in Baltimore City.
<b>City-owned properties</b>								
B.21. Treatment of City owned properties	Current Code states that the Commission has the right to review plans and prepare a report for any projects that involve the reconstruction, alteration or demolition of a City-owned building.  This review is not formalized and is	Informal review. Only formally reviews if designated. MOA with state SHPO for CDBG review, which may or may not be city owned.	Nothing official. Courtesy review of plans for city-owned properties (Chicago Park district, Board of Education) by Commission planning staff.	Unknown.	No difference. Applications reviewed in same manner as other listed buildings. Require other DC agencies to coordinate with them on other buildings (not listed) that are over 50 years old. New mandate within the last year – is still being fully	Designated city properties and right of way in districts are included within review of Commission.  Informal policy for housing and environmental review to be reviewed by Commission for NR eligibility.	Designated city owned properties are subject to Board review. Golden Gate bridge excepted.	Only listed City owned properties are reviewed. City owned properties, not designated as historic, are not typically brought before the Historic Commissions, except for informal comment.

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
	merely advisory – CHAP has no official say in final decision.				developed and implemented.			
<b>Interim Protection</b>								
B.22. Does the City have some type of interim protection mechanism in place, and how often is it used?	Special list- Structures deemed to have exceptional historical or architectural significance which warrant protection. List is compiled by the Commission.	90 day Demolition Delay (Article 85 of the Building Code).  MOA may be achieved for properties with significance but not listed (i.e. Fenway Park).  The BLC reviews any demolition that takes place outside of the local districts or individual landmark properties.  Demolition permit will not be issued before a determination letter is provided from the BLC.  BLC reviews approx. 100 cases per year, with approximately 20% going to a public hearing.	Yes.	Yes.	Unknown.	Yes.	Yes.	Interim protection measures are evident in all case study cities (DC is unknown).
B.23. Criteria for interim protection	Property must be recommended for designation by the Commission.	<i>Location and Age Criteria</i> -all buildings in downtown or Harborpark -all neighborhood buildings at least 50 yrs old -all buildings in Neigh. Design Overlay <i>Significance Criteria</i> -Listed in LC	Property must be designated or pending designation with the city.	All nominated resources receive interim protection and changes are subject to normal HRC review prior to final determination.	Unknown.	Property must be recommended for designation by the Commission.	Property must be designated or pending designation with the city. CEQA provides protection for demolition of any eligible building. Landmarks Board has comment period, then Planning Commission adopts final review. Can be appealed to Board of	Typically, all properties pending designation are protected by interim protection measures.  The designation of other buildings, not seeking designation or with designation pending, are not typically protected by interim protection

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE "GUIDELINES" PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
		<p>Comprehensive Pres Survey as NR / rec for NR / or pending NR</p> <p>-pending designation as a Boston Landmark</p> <p>-historically or architecturally significant</p> <p>-associated with important person or event</p> <p>-loss of structure would have a negative impact on the integrity of area</p> <p><i>Condition criteria</i></p>					<p>Supervisors.</p>	<p>measures.</p> <p>The exception is Chicago. Chicago does rely heavily on their 1995 survey to identify properties worthy of interim protection. Even if not designated, Chicago can delay demolition if building is noted in the survey as being architecturally significant.</p> <p>CEQA gives San Francisco an extra layer of protection against demolition of any potentially eligible building.</p>
B.24. Procedure for interim protection	<p>CHAP identifies properties to be placed on Special List</p> <p>Sign posted on structure noting public hearing to determine whether structure to be added to Special List</p> <p>Once on List, property remains on list until such time that the Commission removes it</p> <p>All permit applications are reviewed by CHAP</p> <p>CHAP may delay permit for up to six months</p>	<p>The staff of the BLC has ten days from the date of the submission of a complete application to apply the criteria and determine whether a demolition permit may be issued or whether a hearing is required.</p> <p>Prior to public hearing, applicant must conduct community meeting. Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services can assist in setting up meeting.</p> <p>BLC public hearing scheduled within 40 days to determine if building will be subject to Demolition Delay. Delay invoked if Comm. finds it is in public interest to preserve, not</p>	<p>If designation is pending, and permit is applied for, there is an expedited process to review permit work by Commission. City Council has 90 days to respond otherwise Commission finding stands.</p> <p>Demolition delay ordinance: non-designated buildings having certain level of significance within city survey may have demolition delayed for 90 days for investigation of other possibilities. If found to be significant, then designation can go ahead after 90 days. City-wide survey conducted 1983-1995 (color coded survey) is public document</p>	<p>All nominated structures subject to interim protection beginning 2 business days after notification of receipt of nomination sent to property owners. Nominated properties are subject to same review process used for designated properties. Protection lasts up to 8 months by which time formal decision should have been made.</p>	Unknown.	<p>Commission can delay demolition permit for 365 days on designated buildings unless economic hardship is found.</p> <p>Properties recommended for listing by Commission, but not yet approved by City Council, are considered pending. Demolition permits for pending listings may be delayed for 180 days or until City Council takes action. No demolition permits can be issued until expiration of period of delay.</p> <p>Upheld in state enabling legislation. Landmarks and districts have some demolition protections if designation considered pending.</p>	<p>Properties with pending designation may have permit review delayed for 180 days, or until designation has been approved/disapproved.</p> <p>Planning Commission can delay demolition for 180 days (individual landmark) or 90 days (building within historic district). Board of Supervisors can extend this for another 90 days.</p> <p>Demolition permits are not approved until permit for new construction has been approved.</p>	<p>Procedure typically includes a pending designation, with the exception of Chicago, as noted above.</p>

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
		demolish. Applicant must prove “no feasible alternative to demolition”.  DD is good for ninety (90) days following the close of the public hearing.	referenced (available on Landmark website).					
C. PROCESS/PROCEDURES FOR PROTECTION OF RESOURCE								
General Policies and Procedures								
C.1. Review and approval criteria against which modifications and additions are evaluated	Guidance provided in the Historic Preservation Guidelines To Assist the Property Owner in Formulating Preservation Plans	Each district has their own criteria, which are loosely based on Secretary of Interior Standards.	Secretary of Interior Standards referenced in ordinance. Building and zoning code has exceptions for rehabilitation of landmarks. <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Guidelines are based on Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, modified by HRC based on input from each HD; guidelines customized to a degree for each HD due to unique nature of historic resources in each.	Secretary of the Interiors Standards distributed by HPO staff to perspective applicants.  They have issued a “Citizens Guide to the DC Historic Preservation Review Process and to Appearing Before the Historic Preservation Review Board”.	Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation (required for State owned properties). Guidelines of exterior rehabilitation for Moore Square Historic District (has been superseded by others, more museum focused which has been found too restrictive). Zoning guidelines for area, density, bulk, yard, building height, and signage. Specifies where historic district or local zoning has primary authority.	Secretary of Interior Standards by rules and procedures.	Criteria for review and approval of designated buildings and districts are all based, to some degree, on the Secretary of Interior Standards. Some cities have modified to “personalize” for their districts.
C.2 Procedure for application for a COA	<b>Minor Applications:</b> Reviewed by staff in 3-5 days Approval forwarded to permit office Applicant picks up and pays fee for permit <b>Major Application:</b> Scheduled for public hearing with CHAP Submittal of additional	If required, zoning and other city agency approval must be received first.	<i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	No hearings for staff-level approvals. Commission-level approvals discussed in at least one regular public meeting. Process: Owner submits application and supporting materials outlining work to be performed. Commission Staff reviews scope of	When building permit is applied for, application automatically forwarded to DC HPO and then forwarded to HPRB.	Two classes of COA Staff issued: Minor work, submitted to staff for review (75%), no hearings Commission issued: Major work, new construction and major additions (2 step), other work (1 step) New construction and major addition: Design	Landmark building major alteration: staff review, Landmark Board hearing, Planning Commission issues COA (2) Major alteration with significant affect on historic building: Environmental impact assessment required. Then Staff review, Landmark Board hearing, Planning	In all cases, staff are responsible for minor application reviews.  If required, zoning variances must be approved prior to review by Commission  The Baltimore City process is typical.



# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
	documentation / application copies CHAP reviews application and renders decision at public hearing NTP permits issued in accordance with CHAP requests HCD bound by Commissions decision			work. If project falls within guidelines of administrative approval, Staff prepares COA authorizing work. If scope falls outside administrative approval guidelines, staff places application on agenda of next scheduled HRC meeting. 1 week notice of meeting given to applicant, owner, head of Bldg. Inspection, and others. Applicant or their rep. must be present at meeting. Commission may request LRC review. At meeting, staff presents application and recommendations of LRC if applicable; testimony ensues; HRC votes to approve, deny, postpone. Notification in writing of decision.. COAs issued for approved work. Denial of application should include needed changes to receive approval for work.		Review Committee reviews work (members of DRC not on COA Committee, kept separate, COA Committee does not see staff reports or informal discussions). Then goes to public hearing. Usually done with 1 public hearing. 6-8 deferrals per year	Commission issues COA (4) New construction and demolition in historic districts: Landmarks Board and Planning Commission (2) Additional demolition protections for residential buildings	
C.3. Time limit within which application is approved if commission doesn't act on application?	30 days from date of filing of application, if Commission does not act	30 days from date of filing of application, if Commission does not act	90 days <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Within 60 days of first review meeting.	Unknown.	90 days for everything. Commission can extend to 180 days when seeking additional “memoranda of authority” (additional investigations). Beyond 180 days, may be further delayed by mutual consent.	Board has 20 days to review and comment before it is sent to Planning Commission for review. Permit streamlining act requires local jurisdiction to decide within 180 days. That only comes into play once environmental review is complete.	-
C.4 Are guidelines	Yes. Mount Vernon has own	No. Each of the local	Yes. Secretary of Interior	No. Guidelines are	Yes. There is one set of	Yes. Historic district	There are citywide guidelines, but each district	Cities with many districts tend to have centralized,

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
applied equally to all districts or are their special rules for certain districts (paint, synthetic materials)? If districts have special guidelines, how are these developed and approved?	guidelines for new construction.	historic districts has their own guidelines, which are all available for download from the BLC website.  The guidelines are developed as part of the designation process and are referred to as “Standards and Criteria”.	Standards applied equally. Commission provides clarifications of hot button issues.  City wide Commercial, Industrial, and Mixed Use Guidelines  <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	customized for each district but based strongly on SOI. District guidelines based on input from representatives of each district and unique character/condition of built environment; all approved by HRC.	guidelines and they are extremely vague and general.	guidelines applied equally, include landscape features. Discussion and guideline format.	may adopt own special provisions for what work requires a COA, even if work does not typically require a permit. Each district may apply stricter requirements for height, setbacks, etc.	general standards. Cities with a smaller number of districts have adopted guidelines for each district.  In Boston, guidelines for the district are developed as part of the final approval process.  General guidelines with wide applicability are most appropriate given the type and amount of historic resources within the local historic districts (in Baltimore).
Special Consideration and Areas of Review								
C.5 What level of detail review is undertaken?  Are paint colors reviewed? Are there samples of approved colors?	Paint color is reviewed	Paint color is not covered within the guidelines. It is reviewed on a case-by-case, building-by-building basis.	Permit review includes signs/billboards, fences  <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Encourages use of original color schemes; reviews paint colors only to prevent use of “odd or extreme” color combinations. No specific colors prescribed. Guidelines specify no painting of previously unpainted masonry surfaces.	Unknown.	Exterior alterations or demolition of elements, including walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, pavement, paths, trees  Paint color is reviewed. No pre-approved palette.	COA for any alterations to landmark or alteration on any publicly visible façade within districts, also includes awnings, signs, canopies.  Paint colors on previously unpainted masonry reviewed in some districts, not reviewed in others, as stated in ordinance.	Extent of review varies by city. Paint color often reviewed, usually on a case by case basis with no firm guidelines, requirements or limitations on colors.
C.6. Is Green Building design encouraged?	City has Smart Growth and Green Building initiatives	City has Guidelines for High Performance Buildings and Sustainable Development. Guidelines discuss building design components and materials, the building site, and building operations.  Section on Historic and Existing Resources	City has Building Green/Green Roof initiative  Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.	Not explicitly. Encourages use of appropriate salvage materials, permits use of recycled modern materials.	Unknown.	Not yet an issue.	Yes. Mayor’s Office of Greening. Very big issue. Solar panel installation hard to review.	The larger cities, Boston, San Francisco, and Chicago, have all begun to address. Smaller cities, like Pittsburgh and Raleigh, have not yet found green building design to be a concern or issue.  Topic is covered in a variety of ways, with Boston having the most sophisticated guidelines

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
		references the BLC and discusses building materials, corner stones, building subsidence, and building reuse.						that specifically address how to incorporate green design into projects involving historic and existing resources. Their guidelines are worthy of further review and incorporation.
C.7. How are synthetic materials handled? Do guidelines list approved or disapproved materials?	Not allowed on primary façades. Review is more lenient on secondary façades.	Generally discourage. Slightly more leniency on secondary façades, but modern materials rarely approved. High threshold.  Each local historic district has own review. Most districts are masonry, very few wood frame. The district guidelines prepared for each district may list materials that are preferred, but do not have lists of approved and disapproved materials.	<i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Varies by district. No lists. Only asbestos siding prohibited outright. Generally, synthetics are not allowed on primary façades; synthetics are discouraged but permitted on parts of building not visible from street view (i.e. side and rear elevations). Siding/trim cladding: Not allowed on primary façade. Windows: Vinyl-clad wood windows acceptable on façade; aluminum windows discouraged but not prohibited; aluminum storms and awnings prohibited on façade.	Unknown.	Generally, do not allow synthetic material. Case by case evaluation. Commission uses precedent. Traditional materials favored in guidelines unless found to be “technically infeasible.” Vinyl siding not allowed; and now it is not an issue.	Do not enter debate. No official statement of rejecting vinyl windows, etc.	Generally, synthetic materials are discouraged but the degree to which this is stressed varies greatly. San Francisco takes the softest approach. Raleigh does not allow vinyl siding and favors traditional materials except when “technically infeasible”.
<b>Review and Approval Responsibilities</b>								
C.8.a. What reviews are conducted by staff and what reviews are conducted by the “Commission?”	Minor Applications are reviewed by staff in 3-5 days. Minor applications are defined in ordinance. Approval is then forwarded to permit office where applicant picks up and pays fee for permit.  Commission reviews applications for new construction, major	For landmarks, minor alterations reviewed at staff level. Staff level review: -routine maintenance and repair -minor modifications or reversible changes For districts, minor alterations reviewed by each local historic district commission.	CLC review is triggered by Department of Construction and Permits. They are part of chain of review if district or landmark to be altered; permit is sent to Commission. Permit Review Committee of Commission may give pre-permit review. Permit Review	HRC Staff is authorized to issue approvals for applications fully complying with guidelines, repair/replacement of elements with matching materials, restoration to original appearance, standard maintenance or renovation elements approved in advance by the HRC, replacement of	All Reviews must go to Board except when minor work is involved – then staff can clear permit applications without referral to the Board.  Minor work includes: -minor repairs -in kind replacements -temporary signage	Minor works reviewed at staff level. Minor works defined in Commission Bylaws and Rules of Procedure Major works sent to Certificate of Appropriateness Committee of Historic Districts Commission. Raleigh has special local legislation to have COA subcommittee (5	Minor work and alterations in conservation district can be reviewed administratively. Staff offer “early read” on proposed work for \$105 fee. All other work reviewed by Landmark Board who has advisory role. Final approval given by Commission.	In all cities, staff have the ability to approve and disapprove minor applications. The definition of minor differs slightly from place to place but it is accepted that minor repairs, in kind replacements and similar work is considered minor.  A specific definition of minor and major should be included in Baltimore’s

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
	rehabilitation, demolitions, or appeals of staff decisions	Major alterations reviewed by BLC.	Committee reviews applications for major projects such as new infill construction, major additions/alterations, and demolitions, as well as decides design policy issues. Staff review for all other projects. After a disapproval, Commission can give informal conference to property owner to resolve problems with work. Approval can be given at this stage. <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	slate roofs with asphalt, other minor alterations. Commission reviews demolitions, new construction, major alterations, changes in materials.	-replacement of air conditioning equipment -installation of rooftop vents -and other negligible changes  Commission is specifically charged with review of major projects and conceptual design projects.  Comprehensive list is included in Ordinance.	minimum members, so can train a small group to deal with this issue).		guideline document for clarification purposes.
C.8.b. Is local district (neighborhood association) review (formal or informal)?	Informal. There is nothing in the ordinance that explains the role of the ARC or its relationship to CHAP.  ARC involvement at an advisory level is encouraged.	Formal. All exterior changes in historic districts are reviewed by one of eight local historic district commissions, which typically include at least one member of the BLC.  The local historic district commissions are decision making bodies.	Informal. Nothing official in ordinance. Community review may be required by Commission. <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Informal. Local review committees (LRCs) exist in 5 of 12 districts; appears to be informal advisory role.	Informal, but their opinions matter. Advisory Neighborhood Commissions review applications. “Great weight” is given to ANCs views by the HPRB, as provided in the ANC Act. HPO staff will meet with community groups before a HPRB meeting. Some community groups do this on a regular basis.	Informal. Nothing official in ordinance. Property owners urged to consult with staff.	Informal. Nothing official in ordinance. Informal design review for some districts. Neighborhoods can pay for service to have Planning staff notify them automatically of any permits pulled for neighborhood (\$10 per permit). Planning literature encourages discussing project with staff.	Boston is the only city with a very formalized relationship between the Commission and the local district committees. In Boston, the district committees are charged with decision making and are appointed upon designation.  In DC they are still advisory but their opinion is given “great weight” by the Commission.  Opportunities for education, staff involvement, etc. with the local district committees varies, as well.  With exception of Boston, there does not appear to be a strong precedent for giving the local groups formal powers associated with decision-making and



# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
								approvals. However, public involvement is important.
<b>Alterations</b>								
C.9.a. Are public hearings required for alteration applications?	Only if CHAP staff decision on minor work is appealed.	Yes. Beacon Hill and Back Bay have more staff level review for streetscape items.  Generally, design change goes to a public hearing. Maintenance or replacement work is done at staff level with no hearing.	Public hearing held only if permit for minor work denied.  <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	All Commission-level applications are presented in regular public meeting with opportunity for testimony on both sides.	Yes, if the application is being heard before the Board (one hearing). No if it is a minor, staff approved application.	COA for major work goes to COA subcommittee. One role call vote at public hearing on easy issues.  Everything else at a public hearing to full Committee.	Board recommends findings to Planning Department who ultimately issues COA. All rejected projects sent to Planning Commission for action and public hearing.	Varies by city based on specific circumstances. No clear precedent. Baltimore’s current process appears to work effectively.
<b>Additions</b>								
C.10.a Are there specific review criteria for additions?	Compatible in scale, materials, and texture. Encouraged to be contextual.	Generally, additions encouraged to be in scale with original building. Rooftop additions should not be visible and should not alter roof lines.	<i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Similar to criteria for new construction. Also, additions should be sympathetic to/compatible with original bldg.; should be secondary; should not remove/obscure significant features of original bldg.	Adhere to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.	Approach is contextual. No specific review criteria for additions. Not proscribed.	Contemporary additions allowed for commercial buildings in conservation districts.  Residential guidelines about alterations and additions adhere to SOI Standards.	-
C.10.b. How are vertical additions handled – adding heights to a building?	Nothing specific mentioned in guidelines	Some districts have height limitations included in their Standards and Criteria Guidelines, for new construction.  Ex. South End limits buildings to 70 feet.	<i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Rooftop structures or new floors on top should be inconspicuous from street level.	Not addressed. Stated only that additions should be compatible.	Generally discouraged.	One story additions allowed in Conservation District Significant Category I buildings. Additional stories can be added to Conservation District Significant Category II buildings. Setbacks third story from front building wall. Minimize visibility from street.	Vertical additions should be addressed in Baltimore’s design guidelines update.
<b>New Construction in Districts</b>								
C.11.a Reviewed by Commission or other City agency?	Commission in conjunction with other city agencies	Reviewed by local Historic District Commissions.	Commission reviews <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Reviewed by Commission	Reviewed by HPRB.	Reviewed by Commission.	Planning Commission reviews. Landmark Board has advisory role. All new construction subject to	New construction is always reviewed by the Historic Commission or Board in historic districts.



# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
							public hearing. Decisions appealed to Board of Supervisors.	
C.11.b Criteria used in evaluation of new construction (contemporary, contextual, compatible)	Contextual, compatible	Specific criteria not always identified in each set of guidelines.  Generally look for compatibility with character of neighboring buildings and surrounding environment	Compatible and complementary <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Looks for compatibility of scale, proportion, wall-opening ratio, materials, detailing, massing, rhythm, siting.	Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, with compatibility stressed.	Contextual (see chapter for new construction)	New construction in historic districts encouraged to be contextual	Contextual stressed in Raleigh and San Francisco. Compatible stressed in all other cities. Baltimore states both.
C.11.c. Height and bulk limits included?	Within zoning code	Architectural changes that increase building heights above contextual rooflines are not permitted in some districts.  However, some districts do not specifically address in their guidelines.	<i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Only in certain areas.	No specific height limitations – focus on compatibility with surrounding buildings.	Within zoning code	Yes. Within zoning.	When addressed, it’s typically through zoning and not design guidelines.  In Boston, some district guidelines do impose height restrictions on buildings, though not all specify height limitations.
C.11.d. Contemporary architectural expression encouraged or discouraged or neutral	Neutral. Nothing specifically stated as to whether it is encouraged or discouraged.	Each district has own guidelines but contemporary designs for new buildings are generally considered to be okay if the “design is of excellent quality and is compatible...” (excerpt from Historic Beacon Hill District).	Encouraged in ordinance: “The intent is to encourage excellence in contemporary design that does not imitate, but rather complements, existing architectural and environmental characteristics of the subject property or district.”  <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Neutral; does not encourage or discourage it.  <i>Response not confirmed with staff.</i>	New buildings should be a “product of its own time”. New construction should be “a good neighbor, not a clone.  Contemporary architecture is encouraged as long as it is a good fit.	Contemporary and compatible architecture not discouraged	COA not required for new building on site of legally demolished landmark Depends on district. Each district has own design intent.	In no city is contemporary design actually discouraged. It is either encouraged, or there is a neutral approach to new construction style.
<b>Demolitions</b>								
C.12.a Reviewed by Commission or other City agency?	Commission reviews as well as other city agencies:	Demolitions are reviewed by each of the local Historic District Commissions.	City Council reviews all Commission approvals for demolition of landmark buildings	Reviewed by Commission	HPRB and then, possibly, the Mayor’s Agent.	Commission has demolition review. Demolition by Neglect in	Planning Commission reviews. Landmark Board has advisory role. All demolitions subject to	In all cases, demolition applications are reviewed by the Commission, though other additional

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
	<p>1. Determination of whether structure is contributing or non-contributing</p> <p>2. Applicant provides justification for demolition</p> <p>3. Review of new construction plans by City agencies</p> <p>City preservation ordinance defines demolition with “affirmative maintenance” language.</p>		<p>(does not apply to auxiliary buildings). City Council must review at next two scheduled meeting and has 365 days to respond or Commission ruling stands.</p> <p>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</p>			<p>Historic Overlay Districts article within Raleigh Code of Ordinance.</p> <p>a. Includes an affirmative maintenance/maintenance standards section.</p> <p>b. Commission files petition with Inspections.</p> <p>c. Hearing held with property owner.</p> <p>d. Commission will issue order to repair.</p> <p>e. Property owner may file for undue economic hardship. Clear statement of documents to be submitted.</p> <p>f. Appeals process.</p>	<p>public hearing.</p> <p>Decisions appealed to Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>Demolition also prompts CEQA review.</p> <p>Planning code has affirmative maintenance provision.</p>	<p>reviews may be required.</p>
C.12.b. Do proposed plans factor into decision-making	No. Commission is not allowed to review proposed plans.	<p>BLC has 90 day demolition delay outside of districts and landmarks.</p> <p>Within districts, all demolition is reviewed.</p> <p>Do factor in replacement plans.</p>	Unknown	Yes. Character of new construction is a factor in overall decision.	<p>Yes. Proposed projects seen by HPRB and factor into justification for demolitions of contributing buildings. HPRB makes recommendation but final say is with Mayor’s Agent who determines if it’s in the public interest, constitutes a hardship, etc.</p> <p>Demo’s are sometimes revised at a conceptual level with applicants seeking comment on “special merit” value of new development proposed.</p>	<p>Design Review Committee is made up of volunteers who do not sit on Commission. They will review proposed plans and make recommendation.</p> <p>The Commission itself does not see plans, but works with Design Review Committee recommendations.</p>	Unknown.	New construction plans are reviewed in association with demolition applications in most cities that provided a response to this question.
C.12.c. When are demolitions permitted	If structure is determined to be non-contributing	Within a district, look at viability, public safety, proposed new construction. Not	Demolition of non-contributing building within district allowed if found not to have	Demolition is permitted for inappropriate additions to or non-significant portions of	When a building is determined to be non-contributing by the Board – specific criteria	Demolition may not be denied on all but state-wide significant properties and locally	Demolition defined as: (1) Removal of more than 25 percent of the surface of all external walls facing a	Typically non-contributing structures are approved for demolition.

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
	or If structure is determined to be contributing but adequate justification is provided to prove a hardship of the applicant or that the structure is a detriment to the general public	hardship. All substantial changes if it benefits overall community/neighborhood with significant preservation component.	detrimental effect on district Demolition of 40% or more of any building or other structure designated as a “Chicago Landmark” or located in any district designated as a “Chicago Landmark”, <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	contributing structures, also allowed for noncontributing structures in district if no adverse effect on district.	and definitions for non-contributing and contributing structures are included in the Ordinance.	designated properties. Demolition may be delayed for 365 days	public street(s); or (2) Removal of more than 50 percent of all external walls from their function as all external walls; or (3) Removal of more than 25 percent of external walls from function as either external or internal walls; or (4) Removal of more than 75 percent of the building's existing internal structural framework or floor plates unless the City determines that such removal is the only feasible means to meet the standards for seismic load and forces	San Francisco has the most sophisticated definition for demolition which allows for little discretion in decision making. A stricter approach, such as this, may make decision-making easier for Commissioners.
<b>Hardships</b>								
C.13.a Is the term hardship defined?	Criteria considered to determine hardship if there is denial of all reasonable beneficial use and reasonable return from the building.  Specific definition for hardship not included.	Yes. Applicant must prove substantial financial hardship – pertains to all Cert. of Exemption applications, not just demolitions.	Hardship defined as denial of all reasonable and beneficial use. Commission decisions can be appealed to county. If economic hardship found, Commission has 60 days to report to City Council and Council has 30 days to review plan. Burden of proof documents outlined in rules and regulations. <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Not explicitly, but has language about owner’s ability to obtain reasonable economic return	“Unreasonable economic hardship” is defined as “circumstances where failure to issue a permit would amount to a taking of the owner’s property without just compensation or, in the case of a low-income owner or owners, as defined in this Chapter, when failure to issue a permit would place an onerous and excessive financial burden upon the owner(s).”  Hardship is not specifically defined other than stated above.	See Demolition by Neglect in Historic Overlay Districts, this is a separate process. Denial of “all reasonable and beneficial use.” Raleigh holds this to a high standard. Only has been reviewed in demolition process.  Hardship has been filed for using traditional materials. Commission has been hard on “technically infeasible” arguments.	No economic hardship issues. State historical building code relaxes building code for historic properties.	Specific definition for hardship would eliminate confusion and help to define what type of justification is needed to prove a hardship exists.
C.13.b. Applicant requirements for	(1) Form of ownership (2) Cost of the proposed	-amount paid for property	Unknown.	Unknown.	-written statement setting forth the grounds that are the	Unknown.	No economic hardship issues.	-

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
proving hardship	demolition or removal, plus estimate of additional costs for compliance with Commission requests (3) Structural soundness and rehabilitation report from licensed structural engineer (4) Fair market value of the property. (5) An itemized breakdown of the economic feasibility of rehabilitation or reuse of the existing structure. (6) Amount paid for the property, the date of purchase, and the party from whom purchased, and mortgage information. (7) If the property is income-producing, the annual gross income from the property for the previous two years; the itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the past two years; and depreciation deduction and annual cash flow before and after debt service, if any, during the same period. (8) Price asked and offers received, if any, within the previous two years. Most recent assessed value of the property and real estate taxes.	-assessed value of land -real estate taxes -annual debt service -any appraisals -any listing or property for sale, including offers -considerations by owner for adaptive reuse -additional requirements for income producing properties			basis for the claim of economic hardship -architectural drawings -photographs -list of witnesses to testify on behalf of applicant -additional information -amount paid for property -assessed value -tax information -considerations for adaptive reuse -statement of income (for low income applicants)			

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
<b>Miscellaneous COA (or similar) application topics</b>								
C.14. Time limit on application?	None.	Secretary of Commission has 8 days to decide whether application shall be acted on.	90 days to act or automatically approved <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	60 days for HRC action; then automatically approved.	Unknown.	90 days.	Commission may delay action on demolition for 180 days (landmark) or 90 days (historic district)	Baltimore is unique in not having time limitations.
C.15 Sample application to make exterior changes to designated properties	Yes.	Yes. Can be provided.	Not available.	-	-	Not available.	COA application form requires property owner to answer general review standard questions, i.e. how does project enhance and restore the historic resource?	-
C.16 What documentation is required with application (photographs, etc.)?	Information for different types of proposed changes are outlined in a checklist appended to application.	-property name -address -owner information -written description of proposed changes -professional advisors and contractors -photos of building/s Other items may be required: -add’t photos -site plan -elevation drawings -specifications -material samples -color samples	Existing conditions (photos, drawings, materials), drawings and/or specifications of proposed work, side by side comparison of old and new windows and doors, replacement materials, site plans, contextual information for additions and new construction. (streetscape photos, site line drawings, elevation photos of buildings on block, etc.) Information on proposed replacement building in case of demolition. <i>Response not confirmed with Chicago staff.</i>	Presentation-level documentation needed; include all information and supporting data needed to fully describe project. Required: detailed written description of proposed work; scale drawings of all work involving change in design (showing dimensions, materials, textures); catalogs, literature or samples of materials to be used; site plans if performing external work. Encouraged: photos, plan/section/perspectiv e drawings, etc.	Unknown.	Sketches, drawings, photographs, specifications, descriptions, and other information	Letter of authorization, reduced scale architectural plans, labeled color photos, etc.	-
<b>PROMOTING PRESERVATION (INCENTIVES, PUBLICATIONS, ETC.)</b>								
D.1. Tax incentives available from state or municipality?	Baltimore City Tax Credit Maryland State Tax Credit	There is a local grant program (not a tax program) called Historic HomeWorks through the Dept. of Neighborhood Development for exterior and interior	Property tax freeze (residential) Preservation façade easements Permit fees waived for landmark properties. Façade rebate for	Unknown.	Historic Homeowners Grant Program provides financial assistance for work in 12 historic districts. DC Code allows a designated landmark to be assessed for taxes at	State: landmark property owners eligible for annual 50% property tax deferral, not available for property owners in historic districts Historic landmark has higher protections and	City: Historic Preservation Fund (not for residential properties), preservation easements County: Property tax reduction (Mills Act), preservation easements	Local tax incentives are limited, though local grant programs are available. Some local and county programs, however, exclude residential properties – limiting their effectiveness.



# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE "GUIDELINES" PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
		<p>rehab work.</p> <p>MA Preservation Projects Fund (MPFF), administered by MHC, offers 50-50 matching grants for municipally owned or not-for-profit owned properties</p>	<p>repairs (commercial and industrial)</p> <p>Property tax rate reduction for commercial, industrial, rental, and some non-profits</p> <p>Floor area bonuses for commercial downtown development of landmarks.</p>		a rate of its current use as opposed to the potential "highest and best" use as allowed by zoning. Requires signing of a 20 year covenant guaranteeing properties preservation.	incentives than historic overlay		<p>A county tax reduction is available in San Francisco.</p> <p>DC provides a slight tax break for designated landmarks that are not private residences.</p> <p>In Chicago, as property tax freeze is offered for residential properties, with reductions only offered to non-residential properties.</p>
D.2. How do you keep public informed (public outreach with newsletters, press release)?	Annual newsletter Website	<p>Informal. Press releases, publications, histories, home owner handbooks, neighborhood publications</p> <p>Study reports associated with potential new landmarks or districts are available at the Commission office and at the BRA library, as well as local branch libraries. Study is also transmitted to the MA Historical Comm. and BRA.</p>	Newsletters, annual report	Unknown.	<p>Series of publications, newsletters, brochures, guides</p> <p>Print Annual report</p>	<p>None. Currently updating website at <a href="http://www.RHDC.org">www.RHDC.org</a> (outside of Planning Department website)</p> <p>Planning Commission is registered non-profit with separate authority.</p>	Nothing formal.	<p>Public outreach across all cities is informal and generally includes whatever people can get by visiting the offices and doing web searches. No proactive public outreach is undertaken.</p>
D.3. Awards program?	No.	No	Yes. Preservation Excellence Awards	Yes. Annual preservation awards for outstanding projects, awarded by the City.	Yes. Mayors Awards launched in 2003 for excellence in HP.	None	No.	Awards programs offered in numerous cities to recognize outstanding preservation work.
D.4. Partnering with nonprofits advocacy groups (i.e.: Baltimore Heritage)	Informal relationship, member of nonprofits must be part of Commission. Groups try to work together to achieve common goals.	The Bostonian Society offers a Boston Historic Markers program which provides markers for historic sites, citywide	No.	Unknown.	Informal relationship with the DC Preservation League which is a citizens advocacy group promoting preservation of heritage of Washington	None	No.	All relationships are informal.

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
<b>COMMISSION ADMINISTRATION</b>								
<b>Commission Specifics</b>								
E.1. Annual Budget of Commission (operating and capital)	Unknown	None	Unknown	Unknown.	Approximately \$500,000 (contact not confident in accuracy of this figure)	\$55,000 from City, also private/grant support (does not include personnel)	Board: approx. \$10,000 year Planning Commission: all preservation activities, including staff costs, within Planning Commission near \$800,000. Most of money for survey work.	Varies significantly. Raleigh has very small budget designated for Commission, compared to other cities that supplied a number.  Need budget numbers from Baltimore to identify how they compare.
E.2. Location within city government	Department of Planning	Environment	Planning and Development	Department of City Planning	Historic Preservation Division of the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs.	Department of City Planning	Planning Department	-
E.3. Number of Commissioners	13	9, plus 9 alternates (BLC)  Each local Commission also has 9 members and up to 5 alternates	9	Unknown.	11	12	9 voting members, 1 non-voting member from Art Commission	Baltimore’s Commission has the largest number of members. Average is 9.
E.4. Eligibility of Commissioners	Each must reside in the city and have expertise in preservation and/or history.  Nominations from 4 preservation non-profit groups, 1 African-American historian, 1 real estate broker, 2 licensed architects, 1 resident of city historic district, 1 commercial property owner in city historic district, 1 city historian, 1 councilmember	Boston Landmarks Commissioners are appointed by the Mayor and approved by City Council.  They are selected from a slate of nominees provided by neighborhood and civic organizations, architects, landscape architects, architectural historians, and city planners.  Historic District Commissions are composed of volunteers nominated by	Professionals in the disciplines of history, architecture, historic architecture, planning, archaeology, real estate, historic preservation, or related fields, or shall be persons who have demonstrated special interest, knowledge, or experience in architecture, history, neighborhood preservation, or related disciplines.	Unknown.	Appointed by Mayor.  Consists of citizen members, historians, an architect, and an archeologist.	Majority of the members of the districts commission shall have demonstrated special interest, experience, or education in history, architecture, archaeology, or related fields.  All members of the districts commission shall reside either within the City’s corporate limits or within its extraterritorial jurisdiction area.  At least one-third of the districts commission's membership shall either reside or own property in an Historic Overlay	By training or experience in the historic and cultural traditions of the City, and interested in the preservation of its historic structures, sites and areas. The voting members shall be residents of the City.	Baltimore’s Commission composition is typical.

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
		neighborhoods, organizations, or BLC – appointed by Mayor. Specific membership varies from Commission to Commission				District.		
E.5. Term of Commissioners	4 years	3 years	4 years	Unknown.	Unknown.	Two year terms, maximum of three consecutive	Original appointments: five shall be for a four-year term and four for a two-year term. After expiration of original appointment, all appointments 4 years	2-4 years is the typical term.
E.6. Frequency of meetings	Monthly	Monthly, plus one local district meeting	Monthly	Monthly discretion to hold additional special meetings w/ 24-hour public notice quorum of 4 required	Monthly	Monthly at least. Most Commission members meet twice a month.	Twice a month	San Francisco is the only city to regularly hold more than one commission meeting.  Boston Commissioners also attend two, though only one is for the Landmarks Commission. One commissioner must sit on each of the local districts and attend their monthly meeting, as well.
E.7. Day or evening	1:30pm	Each local Commission has own meeting schedule – all meetings begin between 4:00 and 6:00 PM	12:45PM	12:30 PM	10:00 AM	Business meeting: 7:30am COA Sub-committee: 4pm	1:00 pm	All meetings are held during normal business hours, though time vary from early morning to late afternoon. No evening meetings were identified.
E.8. Use of sub-committees (standing sub-committees?, design review)	Sub-committees formed for execution of special projects, such as the Guidelines update.	Design review subcommittee for BLC.  For district designations, a commission is appointed to administer and regulate the designated area. This commission would include BLC members and local persons with a	Program Committee reviews public comments on new landmarks and NR nominations Permit Review Committee	May be appointed to study “special aspects” of the HRC’s work	No formal sub-committees At times, HPRB does break into smaller working groups to discuss specific topics May not have legal authority to form sub committees	COA Committee/Design Review Committee Public Relations/Education Committee Research Committee Executive Committee Nomination Committee Design Review Advisory Committee not made up of Commissioners, this is	Architectural Review Committee as needed for early read projects Public Communications Committee listen to public comment if do not meet quorum	Varies by City.

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
		demonstrated interested in the district.				by other volunteers		
E.9. Compensation of Commissioners	None.	None.	None.	Unknown.	\$100/day to attend hearings unless they are a DC or federal employee	None.	None.	None with exception of DC which offers a small stipend.
E.10. Use of Counsel (Solicitor or outside counsel)	Yes.	BLC has access to counsel in city law department when needed.	Counsel provided by city law department, special cases/hearings counsel may be requested to attend	Unknown.	Yes. Counsel provided by Office of the DC Attorney General – represents HPRB and HPO.  This is usually a dedicated person who also represents other DC departments.  Plans to hire a part-time person to assist in writing regulations and enforcement (not assist in lawsuit cases)	None on regular basis.	Yes. City attorney present at Landmarks Board meetings.	Use of Counsel is typical.
<b>Commission Staff</b>								
E.11.a. Number of personnel	7	7 Staff are professionally trained in preservation, architecture, history, planning, and anthropology	11 full time, 1 part time	Unknown.	12 10 full time 2 part time	3	10 preservation specialists within Planning Department	Chicago, DC and San Francisco have larger staff than Baltimore. Baltimore has a larger number of districts that are locally regulated than San Francisco.  Chicago and DC are harder to compare as they are larger and in many ways, “different animals”.  A more detailed analysis of Baltimore’s staffing needs is warranted given the significant scope of duties staff members are required to undertake.
E.11.b. Distribution of personnel by specialty/roles	Director, liason with Planning Department 3 Permit review/technical	6 Preservation planners for 8 districts 1 City archeologist, public outreach	2 Deputy and Assistant Commission (administrative, incentives)	Unknown.	1 - Deputy SHPO 3 – Historians 1 – Preservation Planner	1 - Executive Director 1- Planner II: Preservation Planning, project management,	All meet SOI professional standards for architectural history or history, also archeology and architecture	DC staff includes an enforcement officer and inspector within the department. This would be appropriate for Baltimore,

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE "GUIDELINES" PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
	assistance 1 Historian 1 Administrative Staff/Outreach 1 Curator	Share administrative staff with Dept. of Environment	4 Designation 4 Permit review 1.5 Administrative support		1 – Enforcement Officer 1 – Community Outreach Coordinator 1 – Preservation Inspector 2 – Preservation Specialists 1 – Archeologist 1 – Grants Manager  (6 of the above are responsible for review or permits and Section 106, 2 are inspectors, 1 is SHPO rep, 1 grants, 1 outreach, and 1 national register)  In October are hiring 2 more reviewers and 1 more inspector.	liason with committee 1 - Planner I: COA, design review, liason with committee		even if on a part-time basis, due to the special knowledge and considerations associated with violations of historic properties.
E.11.c. Annual budget for personnel	Unknown.	Limited to staff resources	Unknown.	Unknown.	Unknown.	Department of Planning budget, don't know numbers	Limited to staff resources	Annual budgets typically unknown.
E.11.d. Does staff review permits? If yes, annual number of applications reviewed	Yes.	Yes. 1,277 last year for both staff and Commission review.	Yes. 1,994 permit applications in 2006	Unknown.	Yes. Approved 4,279 permits in 2006. 89% processed at staff level.	Yes. Staff approved COA 125-175/year. Prepares staff report for every case before Commission.	Yes.	
E.11.e. Does preservation staff participate in broader planning initiatives (comprehensive, neighborhood, rezoning, etc.)?	Yes. Site Plan review Subdivision review Urban Design review Neighborhood Master Plans	Yes. Depends on staff resources (overlay districts).	Yes. Commission now has feedback in other projects.	Unknown.	Yes. Works on Comprehensive Plan with Office of Planning. Also prepares 5-year DC Historic Preservation Plan. Participate in localized neighborhood planning with planning dept.	Department is moving that way. This has been done on own initiative, not through formal relationship. Currently building broader planning projects.	Yes.	All participate in broader planning initiatives.
E.11.f. Does Commission / staff administer	Yes. Pilot small grant program within certain districts.	No.	No.	Unknown.	Administers federal grant funds, as well as local grant programs	No formal loan or grant program. Raleigh revolving loan	Historic Preservation Fund Committee outside of Planning Department	



# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE "GUIDELINES" PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
a loan or grant program?					(see D.1.)	fund (slow, case by case basis by City Council, administered by Commission staff)		
E.11.g. Does Commission / staff review work on NR properties within boundaries or assist with tax incentives?	Yes.	Administers the NR when review is triggered by a project involving federal or state funding, permitting, or licensing. Write support letters for tax credits.	No. NR properties getting city assistance may invoke courtesy review.	Unknown.	Yes. HPRB reviews and recommends nominations. SHPO then nominates. Staff assists in preparation of nomination forms and with federal tax credit certification forms.	No. Do informal consultation with property owners.	Yes through CEQA	
E.11.h. Does Commission / staff participate in heritage tourism program?	Yes. Baltimore Heritage Area Received grant to develop a Tourism Management Plan.	Occasionally. Mainly through conference or symposium, tours, booklet.	Landmark Maps distributed to tourist information centers	Yes, has created walking tours of historic neighborhoods and buildings, including interiors of public buildings.	Yes. Create numerous district brochures, publications, DC Index of Places of Historic Interest. There is an education outreach coordinator on staff.	No.	No.	
E.11.i. Does Commission / staff participate in historic surveys/designation?	Yes. Also participate in neighborhood master plans. Staff also has participated in restoration of outdoor monuments (over 50).	Yes. Sometimes receive funds from the MA Historical Commission to do surveys using consultants.  Compiled over 12,000 survey forms on individual buildings and places, as well as development histories on most neighborhoods.  Designation study reports done mainly by staff. This is for objectivity and consistency.	Few surveys in last decade. Rely on 1995 survey.	Unknown.	Yes. Undertake and oversee consultants.	No. Use consultant services.	Yes.	Raleigh is only city that does not do some level of surveying in-house.
E.11.j. Does Commission / staff participate in property	Yes. Edgar Allen Poe house.	BLC is offering professional assistance to preserve significant churches in City	No.	Unknown.	Unknown.	No.	No.	Baltimore is unique in its property stewardship activities.

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE “GUIDELINES” PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
stewardship/museum program?		following closing of 80 churches that was announced in 2004.						
E.11.k. Does Commission staff review and certify local historic tax credit programs?	Yes. Administer Baltimore City’s Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit (to date, 137 projects which generated \$28 million in local investment)	No.	Class L commercial building incentives for Cook County.	Unknown.	Review federal level tax credit projects. No local program.	No.	No.	
E.11.l. Enforcement of Commission actions (which department charged with enforcing design review, notification, site review, penalties, preventative measures)	<p>Originates with complaint to 311 system and email to CHAP</p> <p>CHAP forwards complaint to Housing Department</p> <p>Inspector sent to site Stop Work Order or Violation issued, as necessary</p> <p>HCD inspectors perform review and issue violations</p> <p>Daily penalties \$500-1000 per day</p>	<p>Commission staff notifies owners of properties of violation. Commission staff simultaneously files complaint with Inspectional Services Department. Staff has had good relationship with building inspectors.</p> <p>Ad hoc training with building inspectors as needed.</p> <p>No-action by owner results in presentation of violation to Corporate Counsel.</p> <p>Cease and desist orders issued when work is detrimental to preservation.</p> <p>Can impose action through courts.</p> <p>Fines range from \$50 - \$500. A separate violation shall occur for every day.</p> <p>Will refuse to review other permits on building until</p>	<p>Commission decision on permit work is final, except in cases of demolition, but can be appealed to county courts.</p> <p>Inspectors from Department of Buildings.</p> <p>Stop work orders issued by Commissioner of Buildings.</p> <p>Daily accrued violation fines (\$500-1000) levied through housing court.</p> <p>Demolition by neglect or direct harm to landmark can bring denial of any new building for 5 years and require Commission approval for any new building on this site for 20 years.</p>	<p>HP ordinance part of city building code</p> <p>Violation of HRC decisions and actions is thus a violation of code</p> <p>Inspection/enforcement by inspectors of City Bureau of Property Inspection.</p>	<p>Citizens are asked to report violations to the Historic Preservation Office.</p> <p>2 inspectors (will be 3 in October) who:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-conduct inspections</li> <li>-issue stop work orders</li> <li>-issue violation notices</li> <li>-issue Notices of infraction</li> <li>-fines begin at \$2000</li> </ul>	<p>Inspections Department is enforcing agency for districts and landmarks</p> <p>Penalties include “order of abatement” which is lien on property and \$100/day of violation, no maximum.</p> <p>Districts included on GIS zoning plan.</p> <p>Landmarks are not on GIS maps or on electronic permit system yet.</p>	<p>Director of Planning can enforce ordinance and may enlist Bureau of Building Inspections. Enforcement team within Planning.</p> <p>Director may serve notice, call of District Attorney or police for enforcement.</p> <p>Max \$500 fine, accrued daily (only through City Attorney’s office)</p>	<p>In most cities, separate Inspections departments enforce preservation ordinance.</p> <p>DC and San Francisco have some inspectors/power to issue violations within planning or preservation office.</p> <p>Baltimore should formalize relationship with Inspections, create staff liason, and provide training for inspectors.</p>

# CASE STUDY COMPARISONS

City of Baltimore, Maryland  
THE "GUIDELINES" PROJECT

ISSUE	BALTIMORE	BOSTON	CHICAGO	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON, DC	RALEIGH	SAN FRANCISCO	KEY FINDINGS
		<p>nonconforming work is redone.</p> <p>Use easement grants by outside agencies as way to resolve outstanding violations.</p>						
<p>E.11. Accessibility and ease-of-use of information (handouts, mailings, website)</p>	<p><a href="http://baltimorecity.gov/government/historic/index.php#goals">http://baltimorecity.gov/government/historic/index.php#goals</a></p> <p>Website includes an abundance of information and is well organized and easy to use.</p> <p>Handouts available at CHAP offices.</p> <p>Staff willing to work with property owners and assist local ARCs.</p>	<p>Meetings and site visits with staff are arranged by appointment to answer questions about specific properties or preservation policies.</p> <p>Neighborhood brochures, designation and design review materials, applications, and general information is available at the BLC office and on-line at <a href="http://www.cityofboston.gov/environment/download.s.asp">www.cityofboston.gov/environment/download.s.asp</a>.</p>	<p>Website: Interactive map of landmarks and districts for different regions, photos and significance statement for each landmark and district, architectural tours, architect info, architectural style guide, searchable historic resource database, ordinance, rules and regulations, designation criteria and process, permit review application and process with checklists, standards, and preservation incentives</p> <p>Working on creating GIS-based mapping, overlay 1995 building survey information on zoning</p>	<p>Website with extensive information on HRC and its activities, downloadable guidelines, walking tours, agendas, and FAQs.</p> <p>See <a href="http://www.city.pittsburgh.pa.us/cp/html/historic_review_commission.html">http://www.city.pittsburgh.pa.us/cp/html/historic_review_commission.html</a></p>	<p>Website has a tremendous amount of information.</p> <p>Was not discussed specifically with contact person.</p>	<p>Public outreach is next main goal. Has been focusing on process and procedure.</p> <p>Website: COA process and application, examples of minor and major work, guidelines, COA committee meeting dates, application fees and timetable, links to glossary</p>	<p>Website: 21 pdf bulletins including Board rules and procedures, review procedures for alterations and demolition, COA procedures, designation procedures, incentives, state historical building code, landmarks, districts, surveys, interiors, preservation history, glossary, architectural styles, potential landmark form, architectural review committee, Secretary of the Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties</p>	Varies.

## References/Contacts

### ***Boston***

Ellen J. Lipsey, Executive Director  
Boston Landmarks Commission  
City Hall, Room 805  
Boston, MA 02201  
617-635-3850 ph  
617-635-3435 fax

### ***Chicago:***

Terry Tatum, Director of Research  
Chicago Dept of Planning & Devt, Landmarks Division  
33 N. LaSalle St.,  
Suite 1600  
Chicago, IL 60602

Chicago Landmarks, <http://www.ci.chi.il.us/landmarks/>, accessed July 27, 2007

### ***DC***

Steve Calcott, HP Planner  
DC HPO  
202-442-8800  
[Steve.calcott@dc.gov](mailto:Steve.calcott@dc.gov)

### ***Raleigh:***

Dan Becker, ED of Commission  
Tania Tully, Planner  
Megan McDonald, Planner II, 919-516-2649, [megan.mcdonald@ci.raleigh.nc.us](mailto:megan.mcdonald@ci.raleigh.nc.us)

Raleigh Historic Districts Commission, <http://www.rhdc.org/>, accessed July 26, 2007.

Raleigh Department of Planning website, [http://raleigh-nc.org/portal/server.pt/gateway/PTARGS\\_0\\_0\\_306\\_204\\_0\\_43/http:pt03/dig\\_web\\_content/dept/public/Dept-AboutUs-Planning.html](http://raleigh-nc.org/portal/server.pt/gateway/PTARGS_0_0_306_204_0_43/http:pt03/dig_web_content/dept/public/Dept-AboutUs-Planning.html) accessed July 26, 2007.

Wake County Historic Preservation Ordinance, <http://www.wakegov.com/NR/rdonlyres/0290F5DB-A63D-4CD0-AF26-8041065E1AE1/2482/HistoricPreservationOrdinancetext.pdf>, accessed July 26, 2007.

Raleigh Planning Code of Ordinances, <http://www.municode.com/resources/gateway.asp?pid=10312&sid=33>, accessed July 26, 2007.

### ***San Francisco:***

N. Moses Corrette, [moses.corrette@sfgov.org](mailto:moses.corrette@sfgov.org); 415-558-6295  
California Government Code, [http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/.html/gov\\_table\\_of\\_contents.html](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/.html/gov_table_of_contents.html), accessed July 31, 2007

San Francisco Landmark Preservation Board, [http://www.sfgov.org/site/planning\\_index.asp?id=24996](http://www.sfgov.org/site/planning_index.asp?id=24996), accessed July 31, 2007

San Francisco Planning Code, <http://www.municode.com/Resources/gateway.asp?pid=14139&sid=5>, accessed July 31, 2007